

Historic, Archive Document

Do not assume content reflects current scientific knowledge, policies, or practices.

A47
R312

UNITED STATES
DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
LIBRARY



BOOK NUMBER A47
975145 R312

Issued April 1960

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE
AGRICULTURAL RESEARCH SERVICE
ANIMAL HUSBANDRY RESEARCH DIVISION

PROPOSED CHANGES

in

The National Poultry Improvement Plan
and
The National Turkey Improvement Plan

These proposed changes and supporting statements are presented for the consideration of Official State Agencies and participants prior to the conference which is to be held at the Georgia Center for Continuing Education, University of Georgia, Athens, June 21 - 23, inclusive.

For identification of sections refer to Miscellaneous Publication No. 739 (Revised February 1959), The National Poultry and Turkey Improvement Plans and Auxiliary Provisions.

The detailed procedure for making changes in the Plans will be found in Sections 147.21 through 147.28 of the above publication.

The publication of these proposed changes should not be construed as implying the Department's concurrence with the views expressed or recommendations made.



CONTENTS

PROPOSED CHANGES IN NATIONAL POULTRY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

	<u>Page</u>
Definitions	1
Administration	3
General Provisions for all Participants	3
Specific Provisions for Participating Flocks	5
Specific Provisions for Participating Hatcheries	5
Terminology and Classification; Hatcheries and Dealers	7
Terminology and Classification; Flocks and Products	8
Supervision	12
Inspections	13
Blood Testing	14
U. S. Record of Performance	15
U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock	19
Central Random Sample Egg Production Test	30
Central Random Sample Meat Production Test	31
On-the-Farm Performance Tests	31

PROPOSED CHANGES IN AUXILIARY PROVISIONS

Sanitation Procedures	32
Blood Testing Procedures	37
Procedure for Changing NPIP and NTIP	38

PROPOSED RECOMMENDATIONS

Recommendations Relating to Testing Programs for PPLO and Epidemic Tremors	38
Recommendation to U. S. Department of Agriculture	39

PROPOSED CHANGES IN NATIONAL TURKEY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

Definitions	40
Administration	42
Specific Provisions for Participating Flocks	42
Specific Provisions for Participating Hatcheries	43
Terminology and Classification; Hatcheries and Dealers	44
Terminology and Classification; Flocks and Products	45
Inspections	47
Central Turkey Meat Production Test	48
On-the-Farm Turkey Performance Test	50

PROPOSED CHANGES
in
THE NATIONAL POULTRY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

975115

DEFINITIONS

Proposal No. 1

§145.1 Add to introductory paragraph:

Words used in this part in the singular form shall be deemed to impart the plural, and vice versa, as the case may demand.

Reason: To eliminate the necessity of using both the singular and the plural in certain provisions.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 2

§145.1 Add new definition:

Trade name or number. A name or number compatible with State or Federal laws and regulations applied to a specified stock or product thereof, and which has been filed with the Official State Agency together with a description of such stock.

Reason: There is need for a definition in the NPIP provisions similar to §146.1(r) in the NTIP provisions.

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

Proposal No. 3

§145.1 Add new definition:

Stock. A term used to identify the progeny of a specific breeding combination of chickens. These breeding combinations may include pure strains, strain crosses, breed crosses, or combinations thereof.

Reason: To clarify the meaning of a term which is frequently used in Plan provisions.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 4

§145.1 Add new definitions:

Franchise Breeder. A breeder who normally sells products under a specific strain or trade name and who authorizes other hatcheries to produce and/or sell products under this same strain or trade name.

Franchise Hatchery. A hatchery which has been authorized by a franchise breeder to produce and/or sell products under the breeder's strain or trade name.

Reason: To clarify the meaning of these terms as they are generally used and specifically as used in proposal No. 13.

Proponents: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets
North Central Regional Conference of NPIP and NTIP Supervisors and Inspectors (1959)

ADMINISTRATION

Proposal No. 5

§ 145.2 (b) Second sentence - change to read:

An Official State Agency may accept for participation an affiliated flock located in another State, as long as the two States have one border in common, under a mutual understanding and agreement between the two Official State Agencies regarding conditions of participation and supervision.

Reason: To insure proper supervision of all flocks under the Plan. If a participating hatchery skips over one or more States in securing flocks the chances of the Official State Agency inspecting the flocks are greatly reduced. Under this proposal, if one State is skipped the flocks would be under the supervision of the State in which they are located.

Proponent: Indiana State Poultry Association, Inc.

GENERAL PROVISIONS FOR ALL PARTICIPANTS

Proposal No. 6

§ 145.4 (e) Change to read:

The minimum weight of chicken hatching eggs sold shall be specified by the purchaser of the eggs.

Reason: Make it a rule rather than an exception that the purchaser specifies the minimum acceptable egg weight.

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

Proposal No. 7

§145.4 (e) Change to read:

The minimum weight of chicken hatching eggs sold for replacement stock shall be 1 11/12 ounces each except as otherwise specified by the purchaser of the eggs. The minimum weight of hatching eggs set for the production of broiler chicks shall be 1 10/12 ounces each.

Reason: At the September 1959 meeting of the Farm Bureau National Poultry Advisory Committee the following resolution was adopted and subsequently approved by AFBF Board action: "That the American Farm Bureau Federation oppose the practice of broiler hatcheries setting 'under-sized' eggs."

At a recent meeting the same Committee reaffirmed its position and asked that this matter be brought to the attention of the 1960 National Plans Conference.

Hatcherymen are risking their own integrity when they set undersized broiler eggs. But the practice is still pursued when broiler eggs are in short supply.

The Committee feels that the setting of undersized broiler eggs is definitely an undesirable practice. While this practice would be extremely difficult to control, the Committee would like to see the National Plans Conference adopt a regulation specifying a minimum broiler hatching egg size of 22 ounces per dozen.

Proponent: American Farm Bureau Federation

Proposal No. 8

§145.4 (e) Change to read:

The minimum weight of chicken hatching eggs sold shall be 1 11/12 ounces each for replacement stock and for broiler stock 1 10/12 ounces each for the period November through April and 1 9/12 ounces each for the period May through October.

Reason: Too many small eggs find their way into incubators through the aid of the "purchaser" and result in inferior quality broilers. Flock owners threaten to sell eggs to others unless their hatcherymen agree to buy small eggs also. Outside hatcheries use this as a method of securing new flock owners and eggs in times of scarcity of hatching eggs.

Proponent: North Carolina State Mutual Hatchery Association

SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR PARTICIPATING FLOCKS

Proposal No. 9

§145.5 (a) Add:

The procedures outlined in §147.31 (Proposal No. 54) shall be considered in determining compliance with this provision.

Reason: To aid in clarifying the meaning of "sanitary condition".

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR PARTICIPATING HATCHERIES

Proposal No. 10

§145.6 (a) Add:

The procedures outlined in §147.31 (Proposal No. 54) shall be considered in determining compliance with this provision.

Reason: To aid in clarifying the meaning of "sanitary condition".

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 11

§145.6 (a)(5) Change to read:

Hatchers and hatching trays shall be cleaned and fumigated as described in §§147.34 (b) and 147.35 (d) (Proposal No. 54).

and

§145.6 (a) Add a new subparagraph:

All eggs set shall be fumigated while in the setter as described in §147.35 (b) or §147.35 (c) and refumigated after transfer to the hatcher using the procedure described in §147.35 (c) (Proposal No. 54).

Reason: It is generally recognized that contamination on the shells of eggs and adjacent equipment constitute one of the most important avenues in the spread of Salmonella and other organisms. Fumigation is an essential part of the sanitation program necessary to prevent this means of dissemination.

Proponent: Work Conference on Hatchery and Flock Sanitation Procedures (Established at request of 1958 National Plans Conference).

Proposal No. 12

§145.6 (e) Change to read:

All hatcheries operated under the same name, ownership, or management, shall participate in the Plan, if any of them are to participate. All breeding and supply flocks, hatching eggs or chicks of such hatcheries shall meet the same pullorum-typhoid classification.

Reason: This change is necessary due to the interstate transfer of hatching egg, chicks, and breeding stock within a hatchery organization. In the past, some of these organizations have operated hatcheries in one State as Clean, in another State as Passed and in still another State as a non-participant.

Proponent: Lee Roy Tyler, Supervisor of Plan Work in Tennessee

Proposal No. 13

§ 145.6 (e) Add:

All franchise hatcheries associated with the same franchise breeder shall be construed to be under the same management in the application of this provision.

Reason: So that all hatcheries offering for sale the same franchised product will have the same pullorum classification. Most chick customers are under the impression that all commercial chicks of a franchise breeder qualify for the same pullorum classification if the breeder is participating in the Plan.

The sale of products of a participating franchise breeder by a non-participating hatchery is, in effect, misleading to the customer.

Proponents: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets
North Central Regional Conference of NPIP and NTIP Supervisors and Inspectors (1959).

TERMINOLOGY AND CLASSIFICATION; HATCHERIES AND DEALERS

Proposal No. 14

§ 145.9 Add:

Each participating hatchery or dealer shall be assigned a permanent approval number by the AH Division. This number shall appear on each invoice and shipping label for each separate sale of chicks or eggs and shall be accepted by all Official State Agencies in lieu of any other approval number.

The approval number shall be withdrawn when the hatchery or dealer no longer qualifies for participation in the Plan. All Official State Agencies shall be notified by the AH Division of additions, withdrawals and changes in classification.

Reason: At the present time there are 6 to 10 States that require special approval permits for outside hatcheries to ship chicks or eggs into their States. Each year finds several more States adding these requirements. This requires a large amount of extra work in obtaining the annual approval numbers and completing the proper papers to accompany shipments and at the same time causes the Official State Agencies extra work in approving the applications and listing the qualified flocks.

Our proposal would be to assign each hatchery a permanent National approval number, which is valid in each State and this number to appear on each invoice or shipping label for each separate sale of chicks or eggs regardless of the State of destination.

Proponent: L. Howard Martin, General Manager,
Martin's Hatchery Poultry Farms, Inc.
Lancaster, Pennsylvania

TERMINOLOGY AND CLASSIFICATION; FLOCKS AND PRODUCTS

Proposal No. 15

§145.10 Paragraphs (c) and (d) change to read:

(c) U. S. Certified. All males ROP.

(d) U. S. Performance Tested for Meat. All males and females from Performance Tested Parent Stock for meat production mated in the same combination as used in the qualifying parent flock.

and add a new paragraph to read:

U. S. Performance Tested for Eggs. All males and females from Performance Tested Parent Stock for egg production mated in the same combination as used in the qualifying parent flock.

Reason: To limit the use of the term "Certified" to one type of flock. Flocks headed by ROP males have been designated as Certified for many years and only this meaning of the term is generally known. The inclusion of other types of flocks under the Certified classification is confusing. The use of the term Certified to designate flocks from Performance Tested Parent Stock has been very limited and is not widely recognized. The use of the term Performance Tested to describe products from Performance Tested Parent Stock seems to be logical.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 16

§145.10 (f) Delete

Reason: ARS 44-6, listing participation in the National Plan, indicates only a few States and a very few hatcheries in the Passed classification throughout the United States.

The major difference in National Plan provisions for the two classifications is that Clean allows qualification, following reactors, only after two negative tests while Passed permits qualification on one negative test.

Since the National Plans set up standards of quality control as regards pullorum-typhoid and since the Plan has been in effect for a number of years and the incidence of reactors has been reduced to a nominal figure, and;

Since the control of Pullorum-Typhoid can be best accomplished by a detection and elimination program:

It is recommended that, in the interest of progress and to indicate that the Plan has a sincere interest in the elimination of pullorum-typhoid, only the Clean classification be included in the Plan.

Proponents: Poultry Improvement Advisory Board, California
Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets.

Proposal No. 17

§145.10 (g) Add:

Any hatcheryman who maintains all of his hatchery supply flocks on his own premises can, after three years in which no pullorum or typhoid reactors are found, maintain a "Clean" rating by testing 20% of his breeders each year. If any reactors are found, two years of complete testing will be required before he may again qualify under this provision.

Reason: Most of the hatcheries in Idaho have all of their supply flocks on their own premises and no pullorum or typhoid reactors have been found in many years. Some recognition should be given to such situations.

Proponent: Idaho Poultry Improvement Association

Proposal No. 18

§145.10 (g) Add:

A breeder having four successive years with no proven pullorum-typhoid reactors on his premises need test for pullorum-typhoid only every other year to maintain a Clean rating. In case of a pullorum-typhoid infection, four more years of annual testing with no reactors will be necessary before this provision will be applicable. Any new stock shall be tested for pullorum-typhoid with no reactors before being introduced into a breeding flock maintained under this provision.

Reason: Some breeders have a history of up to 20 years without any pullorum reactors. Three breeders in Washington have been operating from 13 to 31 years without any proven reactors. We feel that such breeders have demonstrated that there is relatively little danger of infection being found in their flocks and that recognition should be given for a long period of maintaining a Pullorum-Typhoid Clean rating without proven reactors. Reducing testing to every other year would result in considerable saving in expense to the breeder.

Proponent: Washington Poultry Improvement Association, Inc.

§145.10 (g) Change to read:

U. S. Pullorum-Typhoid Clean. Flocks in which no pullorum or typhoid reactors were found on the first official blood test by a State Testing Agent, provided for in §145.5 (c): Provided, that if a reactor or reactors are found on the first test the flock may qualify with two consecutive official negative tests; provided that the pens in which the reactors were found are cleaned and disinfected to the satisfaction of the Official State Agency; and provided the twenty-one (21) day waiting period between tests, after any official test in which reactors were found, will not start until the Official State Agency is notified that the cleaning and disinfecting, as required, has been accomplished.

Reason: Now that the percentage of National Plan flocks is about 97% Pullorum Clean, it is time to revise the thinking in regard to the disease control classification to be more in line with a true eradication program. To raise the standards of the top classification of the Pullorum-Typhoid program would, in our estimation, strengthen the National Plan in the eyes of the industry. We realize that problems would be encountered, but in order to approach a true eradication program, considerable revising of attitudes in some States will have to come about by such steps as these:

By allowing only State Testing Agents that are responsible only to the Official State Agencies to test the birds in the top classification, much closer contact and supervision will prevail. By still allowing testing agents of the industry's personnel to continue to test for official classification of the next highest classification, Pullorum-Passed, no obstacles which could not be overcome would occur. States which have very large numbers of birds to test each year could, we are sure, work out personnel problems which would allow them, in a few years, to comply with this top classification requirement. The advantages of testing with personnel who are responsible to the State agency are very numerous and, while there are a few disadvantages, they are small in number when considering the overall picture

of a true eradication program. The Official State Agencies, as recognized by the U. S. Department of Agriculture, have to be further responsible for the accuracy of tests as well as to the direct disease control supervision of these flocks.

The time has come when the pullorum-typhoid classifications must apply to the farm in general as well as to the mere testing of the breeders for that year. The Official State Agency, when issuing a disease control rating, should be in a better position to stand behind that rating, and must know the history of the disease on that farm. More importance should be given to finding and typing the causitive agents in order to build up a history behind each flock.

Proponent: Montana Poultry Improvement Board

SUPERVISION

Proposal No. 20

§145.11 (a) Change to read:

The Official State Agency may designate qualified persons as Authorized Selecting Agents to do the selecting work provided for in §145.10 and as Authorized Testing Agents to do the official testing and blood collecting for those flocks that are to be classified as U. S. Pullorum-Typhoid Passed.

Reason: Same as for Proposal No. 19

Proponent: Montana Poultry Improvement Board

Proposal No. 21

§145.11 Add a new paragraph:

(c) State Testing Agent. A person to be designated as a State Testing Agent shall fulfill the following minimum requirements:

(1) Be paid by and therefore responsible to the Official State Agency during the time of actual testing. (This may be on a per bird basis or on a day or monthly basis).

(2) He shall have worked at least one year with a testing crew in the field.

(3) He shall be able to pass an examination given by the disease control authorities of his State. The examination shall include actual testing as well as a written examination as to the causitive agents involved in *Salmonella pullorum* and *Salmonella galinarium*.

(4) He shall be at least eighteen (18) years of age.

Reason: Same as for Proposal No. 19

Proponent: Montana Poultry Improvement Board

INSPECTIONS

Proposal No. 22

§145.12 (b) Change to read:

Each year a sample of the flocks selected or tested by each Authorized Agent shall be inspected by a State Inspector. This must include the inspection of a minimum of 30% of the flocks of each hatchery. Each flock inspection shall include the examination of a sufficient number of males and females and, in flocks qualified for participation by the whole blood test, the blood-testing of a sufficient number of birds in 15% of the flocks of each hatchery, to determine whether the work of the Authorized Agent was satisfactory and that the flock is qualified for participation.

Reason: Due to the increased size of hatcheries and of breeder flocks, it is felt that a minimum of 15% of the flocks is not a sufficient number for a representative sample.

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

BLOOD TESTING

Proposal No. 23

§145.14 (b) Change to read:

There shall be an interval of at least twenty-one (21) days between any official blood test and any previous test with pullorum-typhoid antigen. Provided that in the case of a flock showing reaction to the last test, the twenty-one (21) day waiting period shall start from the day notification is received by the Official State Agency that the pens in which the reaction was found have been cleaned and disinfected.

Reason: Same as Proposal No. 19

Proponent: Montana Poultry Improvement Board

Proposal No. 24

§145.14 (c) Change to read:

All chickens to be used as breeders must be tested when more than five months of age except that, at the discretion of the Official State Agency, all chickens used as breeders need not be tested in flocks of 500 birds or more. However, a minimum size sample of such flocks must be tested as follows:

Under 500 birds	- all birds tested;
500-1000 birds	- at least 25% tested;
1000-5000 birds	- at least 20% tested;
Over 5000 birds	- at least 10% tested

In flocks where one or more reactors are found in the sample testing all birds in such flocks shall be tested and the qualification for meeting official pullorum-typhoid classifications shall be on basis of testing all birds.

Reason: It is felt that the proposed sampling procedure would detect all so-called "hot" flocks.

Proponent: Bruce R. Davisson, Executive Secretary,
Ohio Poultry Association

U. S. RECORD OF PERFORMANCE

Proposal No. 25

§ 145.17 Delete, and

§§ 145.15, 145.16, 145.18, 145.19, 145.20, 145.21 Change to read:

§ 145.15 USRSP - Random Sample Performance

(a) The RSP classification may be attained by the qualification of stocks entered in central and on-the-farm random sample tests.

(b) To be eligible for qualification the same stock must be entered in five (5) or more random sample tests.

(c) Candidates may consist of any breed and variety, strain or cross thereof.

(d) Stocks may qualify as RSP on the basis of the average performance of the stock in all recognized random sample tests entered.

§ 145.16 USRSP - Qualifications.

(a) Entries may qualify as RSP as follows:

(1) Eggs per pullet housed in all tests entered shall average at least 200 eggs.

(2) Livability of all entries of a breeder shall average at least 90%.

(3) Egg quality of all entries of a breeder shall average at least Haugh units (number to be set by committee).

(4) Shell thickness of all entries of a breeder shall average at least (to be set by committee).

(Average pounds of feed per dozen eggs laid and average body weight will not be considered in USRSP qualifications).

Proposal No. 25 (cont'd.)

§ 145.18 USRSP - Sale of Products:

When products are sold or offered for sale under the RSP classification, the breeder must have evidence that such products are of the same breeding as those entered in the random sample tests in which the stock qualified.

§ 145.19 USRSP - Annual Summary.

The A. H. Division shall publish for RSP participants and other participants at their requests a report comprised of the following:

- (1) Average income over feed and chick cost
- (2) Average eggs per pullet housed
- (3) Average percent laying-house livability
- (4) Average pounds of feed per dozen eggs laid
- (5) Average body weight at end of test
- (6) Average Haugh units
- (7) Average shell thickness

§ 145.20 USRSP - Duties of RSP Supervisor.

The RSP Supervisor shall represent the Official State Agency in its supervision of RSP participation. He shall obtain necessary data on random sample tests and submit the annual summary data to the AH Division for publication.

§ 145.21 USRSP - Duties of RSP Inspector.

The RSP Inspector shall work under the direction of the RSP Supervisor. He shall visit and inspect the work of each breeder and be responsible for the selection of the samples of eggs submitted to the random sample tests.

Reason: Such a program would be worthwhile if all random sample tests could be standardized and an annual report showing the average of all entries of a breeder, would help the confused chick buyer.

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

Proposal No. 26

§ 145.15 (d) Change the phrase "may be withdrawn within 4 months" to "may be withdrawn within 6 months".

Reason: A four month trial is insufficient to insure accurate analysis of dam and sire families due to:

1. Season of the year causes late maturity and short records in Spring and Summer hatches.
2. Early disease onset.
3. Dam and sire family records cannot be analyzed accurately in four months. By six months the effects of seasonality and early pause can be evaluated and analysis of records completed. Families which are not acceptable should be removed from the traps as "W6", to conserve space and expense.

Proponent: Max Brender, Brender's Leghorns, Ferndale, New York

Proposal No. 27

§ 145.16 (a) Change sub-paragraphs (1) and (2) to read:

- (1) If an individual bird has laid at the rate of 60% or more during a period of at least 8 months, when trapnested a minimum of five consecutive days per month and a minimum of fifty days; or
- (2) If the members of an entire family of six or more full sisters have laid at an average rate of 65% or more during a period of at least 8 months, when trapnested a minimum of five consecutive days per month and a minimum of fifty days.

and

§ 145.15 (d) Substitute "8 months" for "10 months".

Reason: Refer to Hutt's book "Genetics of the Fowl", pages 299-301. From the information contained in this section, it would seem that adequate information could be gained by trapping five consecutive days per month, especially if the trapping was done during the first four and last four months of the laying year.

Also refer to Poultry Science, Volume 20, pages 551-555, and Poultry Science, Volume 27, pages 713-718.

If these changes were adopted it would allow the breeder greater flexibility in his program of identifying superior producers, and he would have greater freedom to demonstrate his ability as a breeder. After all, it is the performance of the progeny that is important. Many breeders are finding that it is economically impossible to conform to present requirements.

Proponent: Massachusetts ROP Breeders' Association

Proposal No. 28

§145.17 (a) Change to read:

The pedigree record and wing band shall show that he was produced from an ROP sire and an ROP dam in a single-male mating, or in a multiple male mating if the males are full brothers, except that for beginning ROP participants a male may qualify on other bases acceptable to the Official State Agency and the AH Division, such as having a full sister family meet the requirements of §145.16 (a) (2) or (3); and

Reason: From my own experience, I believe a stronger chick is produced more economically and the pedigree can still be traced as far as production qualities are concerned.

Full brother matings are permitted in the turkey Plan and we can see no reason for not making similar provision in NPIP.

Proponents: Ray Cashman, Cashman's Leghorn Farm, Webster, Ky. Kentucky Poultry Improvement Association

Proposal No. 29

§145.19 Delete

Reasons:

1. Only pure strains are trapnested.
2. Breeders are no longer interested in selling their pure strains. The USROP Annual Summary is purely academic.
3. Intensively bred pure strains, useful in crosses, may be very poor in factors included in the summary. The comparative value of the records in the summary is lost.
4. Since each pure strain is useful to each individual breeder, only as it applies to its inclusion in crosses, publication of the USROP Annual Summary is no longer justified.

Proponent: Max Brender, Brender's Leghorns, Ferndale, New York

U. S. PERFORMANCE TESTED PARENT STOCK

Proposal No. 30

§145.22(b) Last sentence, delete the following:

-- but the sample may be taken from any source approved by the breeder for the production of the grade to be tested.

Reason: This is not needed because this phase of the sampling procedure is prescribed in §145.23 (e) (1).

Proponent: Washington Poultry Improvement Association, Inc.

Proposal No. 31

§145.23 Change section heading to read:

U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock; candidates

and

§145.23 (a) Change to read:

Proposal No. 31 (cont'd.)

The candidates may consist of any breed, variety or strain or cross thereof, or hybrid combination; provided the grade designated as candidates is produced and available in commercial quantities, or is clearly designated as experimental stock not available in commercial quantities.

Reason: The word "entry" is presently used both to describe the stock for which application has been made and a sample of the stock which has been submitted to a random sample test. By changing the word "entry" in the section heading and in paragraph (a) to "candidates" the meaning would be consistent throughout the provisions.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 32

§ 145.23 (a) Change to read:

The entry for U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock may consist of any breed, variety, or strain or cross thereof, or hybrid combination; provided the grade designated for entry is produced and available in commercial quantities.

Reasons: 1. To clarify the meaning of "entry".
2. Any stock not available in commercial quantities should not be entered for U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock.

Proponent: Washington Poultry Improvement Association, Inc.

Proposal No. 33

§ 145.23 (b) and (c) Change to read:

(b) Candidates for qualification as U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock for egg production shall be represented by all entries of that stock in officially recognized central and multiple unit random sample egg production tests.

Proposal No. 33 (cont'd.)

(c) Candidates for qualification as U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock for meat production shall be represented by all entries of that stock in officially recognized central random sample meat production tests.

Reason: Under present rules it appears possible that a breeder could designate which entries in random sample tests he wished to use as a basis for qualifying for U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock. All entries in officially recognized tests should be used as a basis for qualification.

Proponent: Washington Poultry Improvement Association, Inc.

Proposal No. 34

§ 145.23 (d) Change to read:

Application for the U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock classification shall be made by the breeder to the Official State Agency by the beginning of each calendar year for stock to be represented in tests starting during that year.

Reason: To simplify the regulation. The breeder will then automatically enter all his random sample test entries of the stock to be averaged for qualification.

Proponent: Washington Poultry Improvement Association, Inc.

Proposal No. 35

§ 145.23 (d) Change to read:

The entry representing candidates for flock qualification as Performance Tested Parent Stock may be designated by the participant to the Official State Agency at any time desired.

Proposal No. 35 (cont'd.)

Reason: Many entrants in random sample tests are National Plan participants but have not applied for the Performance Tested Parent Stock classification due to costs or lack of demand, but otherwise could qualify. Under the present provisions a breeder's stock may not qualify for export to certain countries due to the fact that application was not made in advance.

or

Add new classification - U. S. Export Performance Tested Parent Stock:

Any participant who is conducting a systematic breeding program, and whose stock has met the performance requirements specified for the U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock classification, may qualify for certification of shipments of such stock for export as "U. S. Export Performance Tested Parent Stock", whenever the demand warrants. The AH Division shall publish a list of eligible stocks at the end of each test year.

Reason: Expediting entrance into potential markets in foreign countries.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Board of New York, Inc.

Proposal No. 36

§ 145.23 (e) First sentence, change to read:

To be eligible for qualification as U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock, the random sample of eggs shall be taken under the supervision of the Official State Agency in accordance with the following procedures:

Reason: To avoid the use of the word "entry" which is confusing in this section.

Proponent: Washington Poultry Improvement Association, Inc.

Proposal No. 37

§ 145.23 (e)(1) Add:

When an entry is made by a breeder who has a franchise or associate hatchery program, the sample shall be taken from the nests of flocks supplying eggs to his associate or franchise hatcheries in the area of the test.

Reason: It should become mandatory and not preferable that eggs be selected from the nests of one, or more than one of any average hatching egg producer in the franchised area. Under present procedures, eggs are not always selected from farm flocks similar to those from which a customer would get chicks. The proposed procedure would insure a representative random sample of the grade of chicks being sold by the hatchery or breeder whose name appears on the reports.

Proponent: Michigan Poultry and Hatchery Federation

Proposal No. 38

§ 145.23 (e)(1) Add:

If flocks other than those on the breeder's premises are used to produce the grade of stock entered, the breeder's flock shall not be included in the sampling.

Reason: To insure the selection of a sample that is typical of the stock at a commercially available level.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 39

§ 145.23 (e)(2) Change to read:

(2) The sample shall be taken from each sampled flock in the proportion the number of birds in each such flock are to the total number of birds in the flocks to be sampled. When the sample is taken from one flock, it shall be taken from each sampled house or pen in the proportion the number of birds in each such house or pen are to the number of birds in the flock.

Proposal No. 39 (cont'd)

Explanation: This change was recommended by the General Conference Committee Meeting in June, 1959. Such changes remain in effect only until confirmed or rejected by the next National Plans Conference or rescinded by the Committee.

Proposal No. 40

§145.23 (e) (2) Change to read:

The eggs shall be taken from the nests, farm egg room, cases of hatching eggs or setting trays in the hatchery, in proportion to the number of birds in each flock represented.

Reason: It is sometimes impractical to sample from several flocks and collect the eggs from the nests. The alternate methods would tend to provide a more representative sample, because eggs from more flocks are likely to be included.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 41

§145.24 (a) (1) and (2) Change to read:

(1) Performance Tested Parent Stock for egg production when such stock represented in one or more officially recognized central or multiple unit random sample egg production tests ranked in the upper one-fourth of the entries, after adjusting for location effect and number of tests entered, or was not significantly different from the lowest ranking entry of the upper one-fourth of the entries, in income above feed and chick costs per pullet housed. 1/

(2) Performance Tested Parent Stock for meat production when such stock represented in one or more officially recognized random sample meat production tests ranked in the upper one-fourth of the entries, after adjusting for location effects and number of tests entered or was not significantly different from the lowest ranking entry of the upper one-fourth of the entries, in rate of egg production on a hen-housed basis and in rate of growth. 1/

Proposal No. 41 (cont'd.)

Explanation: This change was recommended by the General Conference Committee Meeting in June 1959. Such changes remain in effect only until confirmed or rejected by the next National Plans Conference or rescinded by the Committee.

Proposal No. 42

§145.24 (a) Change to read:

Flocks offered for qualification under §§145.22 and 145.23 and for which reports have been made as required by §145.26 may qualify as:

(1) U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock for egg production when such stock is represented in--

- (i) Only one officially recognized central or multiple unit random sample egg production test and the entry ranks in the upper one-fourth of all the entries in that test in income above feed and chick costs per pullet housed.
- (ii) More than one officially recognized central or multiple unit random sample egg production test and the rank shall be based upon the average in all such tests. This rank shall be in the upper one-fourth of the entries after adjusting for location effects and number of tests entered, or is not significantly different from the lowest ranking entry of the upper one-fourth of the entries in income above feed and chick costs per pullet housed.

(2) U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock for meat production when such stock is represented in--

- (i) Only one officially recognized central random sample meat production test and the entry ranks in the upper one-fourth of all the entries in that test in rate of egg production on a hen-housed basis and in rate of growth

Proposal No. 42 (cont'd.)

(ii) More than one officially recognized central random sample meat production test and the rank shall be based upon the average in all such tests. This rank shall be in the upper one-fourth of the entries after adjusting for location effects and number of tests entered, or is not significantly different from the lowest ranking entry of the upper one-fourth of the entries in rate of egg production on a hen-housed basis and in rate of growth.

Reasons: 1. To clarify the intent of this section, namely, base the ranking on an average of all tests in which a designated stock is competing.

2. A single entry does not give a satisfactory basis for comparison with entries in other tests. Therefore, these single entries should be computed separately from the calculations involving the entries in two or more tests. The basis for qualification of an entry in a single test should be somewhat higher than the qualification standard of those entries in two or more tests.

Proponent: Washington Poultry Improvement Association, Inc.

Proposal No. 43

§ 145.24 (a)(1) and (2) Change to read:

(1) Performance Tested Parent Stock for egg production; when such stock represented in two or more officially recognized central or multiple unit random sample egg production tests by entries which averaged to rank above the test averages, for all tests entered, in income above feed and chick costs per pullet housed.

(2) Performance Tested Parent Stock for meat production; when such stock represented in two or more officially recognized random sample meat production tests by entries which averaged to rank above the test averages, for all tests entered, in rate of growth.

Proposal No. 43 (cont'd.)

Reasons: (1) When a stock is entered in only one test its performance does not reliably predict its subsequent performance under other conditions. It has been suggested that candidates for Performance Tested Parent Stock should be represented by entries in at least two random sample tests.

(2) Rate of growth is of paramount importance in the production of poultry meat. When the primary use of a stock is for meat production, it is unrealistic to withhold recognition of its meat production qualities unless it also excels in a secondary trait such as egg production.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 44

§ 145.24 (a)(2) Change to read:

(2) Performance Tested Parent Stock for meat production when such stock represented in an officially recognized random sample meat production test by an entry which ranked in the upper one-half of the entries, or was not significantly different from the top entry in average rate of egg production on hen-housed basis and in rate of growth. 1/ (When the breeder has entries in more than one central or multiple unit random sample test, qualification shall be based upon the average performance records in all such tests).

Reason: With the decrease in spread of rate of growth and egg production in meat stocks it becomes unrealistic to only qualify the upper one-fourth.

Proponent: Dr. M. R. McClung, Head of the Poultry Department, University of Rhode Island

Proposal No. 45

§145.24 (d) Add:

When the entry (or entries) on which qualification is based is the progeny of a combination of two stocks which are distributed commercially under different strain or trade names, the Performance Tested Parent Stock classification shall be limited to those matings in which the same stocks are combined. This limitation shall be specified when the Performance Tested Parent Stock classification is referred to in advertising or certification of either of the parent stocks.

Reason: To clarify the use of Performance Tested Parent Stock terminology with respect to joint entries or other entries of crossbred stock.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 46

§145.26 Change introductory paragraph to read:

The Official State Agency, or the Supervisor of the approved test, shall submit to the AH Division, for publication, whichever of the following reports are appropriate for each entry.

(and similar changes in §§145.27 (e), 145.28 (h) and 145.29 (i))

Reason: §145.22(a) provides for recognition of tests not conducted by Official State Agencies. Reports from such tests would be made by the test Supervisor rather than the Official State Agency.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 47

§145.26 (a) Amend by changing subparagraphs (9) (11) (13) (14) and (15) to read:

(9) Average annual egg weight;

Proposal No. 47 (cont'd.)

- (11) Average percent egg production from age at 50% production to 500 days of age, hen-day basis;
- (13) Pounds of feed per 24 ounces of eggs produced;
- (14) Average body weight in pounds and tenths at end of test;
- (15) Egg quality data such as; Haugh units, shell thickness and percent of eggs with (i) small blood spots (ii) large blood spots (iii) small colored meat spots (iv) large colored meat spots;

and adding a new subparagraph (16) to read:

- (16) Net income computed on the basis of returns over feed and chick cost per pullet housed;

and

§145.26 (b)(1) Amend by deleting subdivisions (xi) (xii) (xiii) (xiv) and (xv) and changing subdivisions (viii) (ix) and (x) to read:

- (viii) Average live weight of all pullets at completion of test;
- (ix) Average live weight of all cockerels at completion of test;
- (x) Number of each sex dressed;

and adding new subdivisions (xi) (xii) and (xiii) to read:

- (xi) Percent eviscerated yield of live weight by sexes;
- (xii) Percent distribution in each U. S. Grade by sexes;
- (xiii) Feed conversion per pound of body weight; and

Reason: To incorporate the traits to be measured as agreed upon by the General Conference Committee, the Council of American Official Poultry Tests, the National Committee on Random Sample Poultry Testing and the Department, in developing recommendations for coordinating random sample tests as requested by the 1958 Conference.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 48

§ 145.26 (b)(1) Add a new subdivision to read:

The formula of the feed used;

Reason: It would be helpful in the interpretation of results from all random sample tests if each test reported the formula of the feed used in growing out the birds.

Proponent: Arkansas Poultry Improvement Association

CENTRAL RANDOM SAMPLE EGG PRODUCTION TEST

Proposal No. 49

§145.27 (a) and §145.29 (a) Delete the phrase "and a control stock approved by the Department".

Reason: Since various commercial stocks are entered in most of the random sample tests, it is felt that these stocks can be used in lieu of a control stock.

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Market

Proposal No. 50

§ 145.27

Provide for uniform egg and feed prices to be used by all random sample tests in computing income.

Reason: Feed and egg prices cause greater variation in net income shown in random sample test reports than the number of eggs laid per bird housed. This proposal would tend to narrow differences between tests down to environment and management as the main differences.

Proponent: Michigan Poultry and Hatchery Federation

Proposal No. 51

§145.27 (b) Change to read:

The sample shall be selected as provided in §145.23 (e).

Reason: To prescribe the same sampling procedure in each of the two sections.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

CENTRAL RANDOM SAMPLE MEAT PRODUCTION TEST

Proposal No. 52

§145.29 (g) Change to read:

The duration of the growing test shall be either 7, 8, or 9 weeks.

and

Make necessary changes in §145.29 (h) and §145.26 (b)(1)(ii) to conform with the change in §145.29 (g).

Reason: In many instances, samples of test birds have to be processed at commercial dressing plants. The carcasses of birds grown to 8 or 9 weeks are larger than processors desire in certain areas. Therefore, in order to facilitate collection of yield and carcass data, it is necessary to provide the option of a 7 week growing period.

Proponent: Arkansas Poultry Improvement Association

ON-THE-FARM PERFORMANCE TESTS

Proposal No. 53

§§145.30, 145.31, 145.32 - Delete.

Reason: On-the-Farm Performance tests no longer have any practical value.

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

PROPOSED CHANGES IN AUXILIARY PROVISIONS

Proposal No. 54

Part 147 add:

Subpart D - Sanitation Procedures

§ 147.31 Flock sanitation. To aid in the maintenance of healthy flocks the following procedures should be practised:

(a) Chicks or poult should be started in a clean brooder house and maintained in constant isolation from older birds and other animals. Personnel that are in contact with older birds and other animals should take precautions, including disinfection of footwear and change of outer clothing, to prevent the introduction of infection through droppings that may adhere to the shoes, clothing or hands. (See § 147.34 (a))

(b) Young stock should be grown on range that has not been used for poultry for at least one year. Where broods of different ages must be kept on the same farm, there should be complete depopulation of brooder houses and other premises following any contagious disease.

(c) Poultry houses should be screened and proofed against free-flying birds. An active rodent eradication campaign is an essential part of the general sanitation program. The area adjacent to the poultry house should be kept free from accumulated manure, rubbish and unnecessary equipment. Dogs, cats, sheep, cattle, horses, and swine should never have access to poultry operations. Visitors should not be admitted to poultry areas and authorized personnel should take the necessary precautions to prevent the introduction of disease.

(d) Poultry houses and equipment should be thoroughly cleaned and disinfected prior to use for a new lot of birds. (See § 147.34(a)) Feed and water containers should be situated where they cannot be contaminated by droppings and should be frequently cleaned and disinfected. Dropping boards or pits should be constructed so birds do not have access to the droppings.

(e) Poultry house floors, other than slats or wire, should be well covered with an absorbent type of litter. Frequent stirring of the litter may be necessary to reduce excess moisture and prevent surface accumulation of droppings. Slat or wire floors should be constructed so as to permit free passage of droppings and to prevent the birds from coming in

contact with the droppings. Nesting areas should be kept clean and, where appropriate, filled with clean nesting material.

(f) Birds that die or are sick should be taken, by private carrier, to a diagnostic laboratory for complete examination. All *Salmonella* and *Arizona* cultures isolated should be typed serologically and complete records maintained as to types recovered from each flock within an area. Such information is necessary for the development of an effective *Salmonella* control program.

§147.32 Hatching egg sanitation. Hatching eggs should be collected from the nests at frequent intervals and to aid in the prevention of contamination with disease causing organisms, the following practices should be observed:

(1) Cleaned and disinfected containers should be used in collecting the eggs and precautions taken to prevent contamination from organisms that may be present on the hands or clothing of the person making the collection.

(2) Dirty eggs should not be used for hatching purposes and should be collected in a separate container from hatching eggs. Slightly soiled eggs may be dry cleaned by hand or motor driven buffer.

(3) As soon as possible after collection the visibly clean eggs should be fumigated as described in §147.35 (a).

(4) After fumigation the eggs should be stored in a cool place. Eggs should be stored for as short a period as possible before setting. Racks used for storing eggs should be properly cleaned and disinfected.

(5) New or fumigated cases should be used to transport eggs to the hatchery. Soiled egg case fillers should be discarded.

§147.33 Hatchery sanitation. An effective program for the prevention and control of *Salmonella* and other infections should include the following measures:

(a) The hatchery building should be arranged so that separate rooms, with separate ventilation, are provided for each of the three operations, egg receiving, incubation and hatching, and chick holding. These rooms should be placed under isolation so that admission is granted only to

Proposal No. 54 (cont'd.)

specifically authorized personnel who have taken proper precautions to prevent introduction of diseases.

- (b) The hatchery rooms, tables, racks, and other equipment in them should be thoroughly clean and disinfected frequently. All hatchery wastes and offal should be burned or otherwise properly disposed of and the containers used to remove such materials should be cleaned and sterilized after each use.
- (c) The hatching compartment of incubators, including the hatching trays, should be thoroughly cleaned, and fumigated after each hatch.
- (d) Only clean eggs should be used for hatching purposes. All eggs set should be fumigated prior to setting or within 12 hours after they are placed in the incubator. They should also be fumigated after transfer to the hatching compartment. (See §147.35 (a))
- (e) Only new or clean fumigated egg cases should be used for transportation of hatching eggs. Soiled egg case fillers should be destroyed.
- (f) Distribute day-old chicks, pouls or other newly hatched poultry in clean, new boxes. All crates and vehicles used for transporting started or adult birds should be clean and disinfected after each use.

§147.34 Cleaning and disinfecting

- (a) In the poultry houses and hatchery rooms, cleaning and disinfecting includes:
 - (1) Settling of dust by spraying lightly with the disinfectant to be used.
 - (2) Removal of all litter and droppings to an isolated area where there is no opportunity for dissemination of any infectious disease organisms that may be present.
 - (3) Scrub the walls, floors and equipment with a hot soapy water solution. Rinse to remove soap.

(4) Spray with a cresylic disinfectant, such as liquor cresolis saponatus, 4 ounces to the gallon of water, or sodium orthophenylphenate, 1 1/3 ounces (1 heaping tablespoonful) to a gallon of hot water.

(b) In the hatchers, cleaning and disinfecting includes the following procedures:

(1) Remove trays and all controls and fans for separate cleaning. The ceiling, walls and floors should be thoroughly wetted with a stream of water, then scrubbed with a hard bristle brush. Rinse until there is no longer any deposit on the walls, particularly near the fan opening.

(2) Replace the cleaned fans and controls. Replace the trays, preferably still wet from cleaning, and bring the incubator up to normal operating temperature.

(3) Before placing eggs in the hatcher, it should be fumigated as described in §147.35 (d).

(4) If eggs are hatched in the same machine as they are incubated, the entire machine should be cleaned after each hatch. A vacuum cleaner should be used to remove chick down from the egg trays, then the entire machine should be vacuumed, mopped and fumigated as described in §147.35 (c).

§147.35 Fumigation. Fumigation of eggs and incubators is an essential part of a hatchery sanitation program.

(a) Preincubation fumigation of eggs should be done as follows:

(1) Provide a room or cabinet proportionate to the number of eggs to be handled. The room should be relatively tight and equipped with a fan to circulate the gas during fumigation and to expel it after fumigation.

(2) The eggs should be placed in the room on wire racks, which will not prohibit air circulation, and exposed to circulating formaldehyde gas.

(3) Formaldehyde gas is provided by mixing 0.6 grams of potassium permanganate with 1.2 cc of formalin (37.5%) for each cubic foot of space in the room. The ingredients should be mixed in an earthenware or enamelware container having a capacity at least ten times the volume of the total ingredients.

Proposal No. 54 (cont'd.)

(4) Circulate the gas within the room for 20 minutes then expel.

(5) Humidity for this type of fumigation is not critical but the temperature should be around 70 °F. Extra humidity may be provided in dry weather.

(b) Eggs which have not been fumigated prior to setting should be fumigated as soon as possible and no later than 12 hours after setting using the following procedure:

(1) Determine the size of the incubator by multiplying the length times the width times the height.

(2) After setting the eggs and allowing temperature and humidity to regain normal operating levels, release formaldehyde gas into the incubator.

(3) For each cubic foot of space in the incubator use 0.6 grams of potassium permanganate and 1.2 cc of formalin (37.5%). Use a container having a capacity of at least ten times the volume of the total ingredients.

(4) Close vents and doors but keep circulating fan operating and continue fumigation for 20 minutes with normal operating temperature and humidity.

(5) After 20 minutes of fumigation the vents should be opened to the normal operating positions to release the gas.

(c) All eggs set should be fumigated at some time prior to transfer to the hatching compartment and re-fumigated after transfer to the hatcher. The fumigation schedule should be such that no eggs are fumigated during the period from the 24th to the 96th hour of incubation. Eggs not fumigated as described in paragraph (b) of this section should be fumigated after the 96th hour of incubation. The procedure described in paragraph (b) of this section should be followed except that 0.4 gram of potassium permanganate and 0.8 cc of formalin should be used for each cubic foot of space in the incubator.

(d) Fumigation of empty hatchers between each hatch is recommended. After the interior of the hatcher has been thoroughly cleaned and the cleaned trays returned the following procedure should be followed:

Proposal No. 54 (cont'd.)

(1) After temperature and humidity are brought to normal operating levels use 0.6 grams of potassium permanganate and 1.2 cc of formalin per cubic foot of space in the hatcher.

(2) Close the doors and vents and leave closed overnight.

Proponent: Work Conference on Hatchery and Flock Sanitation Procedures (Established at request of 1958 National Plans Conference).

SUBPART A - BLOOD TESTING PROCEDURES -
The stained antigen, rapid, whole-blood test

Proposal No. 55

§ 147.3 (b) Fifth sentence - Change to read:

All testing kits used in conducting the whole-blood stained antigen blood test shall be equipped with a clear glass plate or plates of appropriate size. An electric light bulb shall be mounted in the kit so the reflected light of the bulb may be used for reading the samples. Heat (60° - 80°F) will be supplied by light bulbs. (Additional heating elements may be installed for extremely cold weather conditions).

and

§ 147.3 (c) Fifth, sixth and seventh sentences - Change to read:

The loopful of blood then should be stirred thoroughly into the drop of antigen and the mixture spread to a diameter of about 1 inch. The loop should then be wiped clean.

Reason: Many times the light conditions in a poultry house are far from ideal for conducting accurate blood tests. The above change will prescribe a uniform testing kit that will make the reading of the individual test easy and accurate.

Proponent: Earl Reitsma, Poultry Supervisor, Oregon Department of Agriculture, 105 Poultry Building, Corvallis, Oregon

SUBPART C - PROCEDURE FOR CHANGING NATIONAL POULTRY
AND TURKEY IMPROVEMENT PLANS

Proposal No. 56

§147.26 (a) Change to read:

The following eight committees shall be established to give preliminary consideration to the proposed changes, falling in their respective fields:

- (1) NPIP General Provisions
- (2) NPIP Breeding
- (3) NPIP Disease Control
- (4) NPIP Random Sample Tests
- (5) NTIP General Provisions
- (6) NTIP Breeding
- (7) NTIP Disease Control
- (8) NTIP Random Sample Tests

Reason: Random Sample Test Committees would be in a better position to deal with proposals relating to such tests.

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

RECOMMENDATIONS RELATING TO TESTING PROGRAMS FOR
PPLO AND EPIDEMIC TREMORS

Proposal No. 57

It is recommended that the National Plans Conference make an extensive study of testing for PPLO, and consider the adoption of a testing program for this group of organisms as soon as a satisfactory test is available.

Reason: CRD is a major problem in broiler production today, and if the identification of PPLO organisms in breeder hens is practical, tests should be made so that this source of infection may be eliminated.

Proponent: C. B. Sledge, Sledge-Townsend Feed Company, Inc., Hammond, Louisiana

Proposal No. 58

It is recommended that the NPIP Disease Control Committee study the feasibility of establishing a testing program for the control of epidemic tremors.

Reason: Certain hatcheries are now using a test and elimination or vaccination program in their individual operation and it is felt that such a program on a nation wide basis may be desirable.

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

RECOMMENDATION TO U. S. DEPARTMENT OF AGRICULTURE

Proposal No. 59

In view of the need for more basic information to guide the development of effective poultry hatchery and flock sanitation programs, it is recommended that further research be done in the following fields:

1. Air sampling. Study air sampling techniques and subsequent analysis as means of evaluating the effectiveness of sanitation programs. Determine the correlation between effective sanitation programs as indicated by air analysis and chick or poult mortality from hatchery disseminated diseases.
2. Hatchery construction. Develop specifications for hatchery buildings, including floor plans and construction materials, that will provide optimum sanitary conditions.
3. Fumigation of eggs in containers. Study the efficacy of fumigation of eggs, while packed in wire baskets or conventional shipping cases, to destroy disease causing organisms.
4. Disposal of hatchery waste. Determine procedures for removal and disposition of unhatched eggs, egg shells, chick down, dead chicks, etc. from the hatchery to provide maximum security against contamination of the hatchery.
5. Temperature and humidity in fumigation. Study the influence of variations in temperature and humidity on the effectiveness of formaldehyde fumigation of eggs and hatchery equipment.

Proposal No. 59 (cont'd.)

6. Salmonella contamination of poultry feed. Investigate extent and effect of Salmonella contamination of feed and determine procedures necessary to eliminate this source of infection in poultry flocks. These studies should include methods of sanitizing feed containers, including bags, bins and bulk delivery trucks.
7. Disinfection. Develop effective methods for sanitizing egg cases, chick and poult boxes, bird crates and delivery trucks. Further studies are needed on the application of newer disinfectants in poultry disease control and eradication programs.

Proponent: Work Conference on Hatchery and Flock Sanitation Procedures (Established at request of 1958 National Plans Conference).

PROPOSED CHANGES
IN
THE NATIONAL TURKEY IMPROVEMENT PLAN

DEFINITIONS

Proposal No. 60

§146.1 Add to introductory paragraph:

Words used in this part in the singular form shall be deemed to impart the plural, and vice versa, as the case may demand.

Reason: To eliminate the necessity of using both the singular and the plural in certain provisions.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 61

§146.1 (s) Change to read:

Broad-breasted. A term used to describe a type of turkey which at the time of selection, and not later than 30 weeks of age, has a breast width at a point 1 3/4 inches above the keel, of at least 4 inches, for both toms and hens.

Reason: It is felt that, with improved breeding, the 3 1/2 inch measurement is no longer adequate for birds described as "Broad-breasted".

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

Proposal No. 62

§146.1 Add new definition:

Stock. A term used to identify the progeny of a specific breeding combination of turkeys. These breeding combinations may include pure strains, strain crosses, breed-crosses, or combinations thereof.

Reason: To clarify the meaning of a term which is frequently used in Plan provisions.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 63

§146.1 Add new definitions:

Franchise Breeder. A breeder who normally sells products under a specific strain or trade name and who authorizes other hatcheries to produce and/or sell products under this same strain or trade name.

Franchise Hatchery. A hatchery which has been authorized by a franchise breeder to produce and/or sell products under the breeder's strain or trade name.

Reason: To clarify the meaning of these terms as they are generally used and specifically as used in proposal No. 68.

Proponents: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets
North Central Regional Conference of NPIP and NTIP
Supervisors and Inspectors (1959)

ADMINISTRATION

Proposal No. 64

§146.2 (b) Second sentence - Change to read:

An Official State Agency may accept for participation an affiliated flock located in another State, as long as the two States have one border in common, under a mutual understanding and agreement between the two Official State Agencies regarding conditions of participation and supervision.

Reason: To insure proper supervision of all flocks under the Plan. If a participating hatchery skips over one or more States in securing flocks, the chances of the Official State Agency inspecting the flocks are greatly reduced. Under this proposal, if one State is skipped, the flocks would be under the supervision of the State in which they are located.

Proponent: Indiana State Poultry Association, Inc.

SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR PARTICIPATING FLOCKS

Proposal No. 65

§146.5 (a) Add:

The procedures outlined in §147.31 (Proposal No. 54) shall be considered in determining compliance with this provision.

Reason: To aid in clarifying the meaning of "sanitary condition".

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

SPECIFIC PROVISIONS FOR PARTICIPATING HATCHERIES

Proposal No. 66

§ 146.6 (a) Add:

The procedures outlined in 147.31 (Proposal No. 54) shall be considered in determining compliance with this provision.

Reason: To aid in clarifying the meaning of "sanitary condition".

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 67

§ 146.6 (a)(5) Change to read:

Hatchers and hatching trays shall be cleaned and fumigated after each hatch as described in §§ 147.34 (b) and 147.35 (d) (Proposal No. 54).

and

§ 146.6 (a) Add new paragraph:

(6) All eggs set shall have been fumigated as described in § 147.35 (a) and refumigated as described in § 147.35 (c) or within 12 hours after setting shall be fumigated as described in § 147.35 (b). All eggs shall be fumigated after transfer to the hatcher as described in § 147.35 (c) (Proposal No. 54).

Reason: It is generally recognized that contamination of the shells of eggs and adjacent equipment constitute one of the most important avenues in the spread of *Salmonella* and other organisms. Fumigation is an essential part of the sanitation program necessary to prevent this means of dissemination.

Proponent: Work Conference on Hatchery and Flock Sanitation Procedures (Established at request of 1958 National Plans Conference).

Proposal No. 68

§146.6 (e) Add:

All franchise hatcheries associated with the same franchise breeder shall be construed to be under the same management in the application of this provision.

Reason: So that all hatcheries offering for sale the same franchised product will have the same pullorum classification. Most poult customers are under the impression that all commercial poults of a franchise breeder qualify for the same pullorum classification if the breeder is participating in the Plan. The sale of products of a participating franchise breeder by a non-participating hatchery is, in effect, misleading to the customer.

Proponents: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets
North Central Regional Conference of NPIP and NTIP
Supervisors and Inspectors (1959)

TERMINOLOGY AND CLASSIFICATION; HATCHERIES AND DEALERS

Proposal No. 69

§146.9 Add:

Each participating hatchery or dealer, shall be assigned a permanent approval number by the AH Division. This number shall appear on each invoice and shipping label for each separate sale of poults or eggs and shall be accepted by all Official State Agencies in lieu of any other approval number.

The approval number shall be withdrawn when the hatchery or dealer no longer qualifies for participation in the Plan. All Official State Agencies shall be notified by the AH Division of additions, withdrawals and changes in classification.

Reason: At the present time there are 6 to 10 States that require a special approval permit for outside hatcheries to ship poults or eggs into their States. Each year finds several more States adding these requirements. This requires a large amount of extra work in obtaining the annual approval numbers and completing the proper papers to accompany

Proposal No. 69 (cont'd.)

shipments and at the same time causes the Official State Agencies extra work in approving the applications and listing the qualified flocks.

Our proposal would be to assign each hatchery a permanent National approval number, which is valid in each State and this number to appear on each invoice or shipping label for each separate sale of poult or eggs regardless of the State of destination.

Proponent: L. Howard Martin, General Manager,
Martin's Hatchery Poultry Farms, Inc.,
Lancaster, Pennsylvania

TERMINOLOGY AND CLASSIFICATION; FLOCKS AND PRODUCTS

Proposal No. 70

§146.10 (b) Change to read:

U. S. Performance Tested Parent Stock. Stock represented in a central turkey meat production test as provided for in §146.30 by an entry with a combined performance average that equaled or exceeded the test average for the following traits:

- (1) Viability. (Percent of started birds alive at end of test).
- (2) Feed Conversion. (Pounds of feed required to produce one pound of live turkey).
- (3) Eviscerated Yield. (Percent of live weight in dressed carcass).
- (4) Market Quality. (Percent of the total eviscerated weight meeting the requirements for U. S. Grade A).

(When the stock is entered in more than one central turkey meat production test, qualification shall be based upon the average performance records in all tests entered).

Proposal No. 70 (cont'd.)

Reason: This proposal would base qualification for Performance Tested Parent Stock classification on traits which are of importance to the producer of market turkeys and equally applicable to all types and sizes of turkeys.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 71

§ 146.10 (c)(3) Delete:

and

§ 146.10 (c) Add a new paragraph to read:

U. S. Performance Tested. All males and females from Performance Tested Parent Stock. In case the tested stock is a cross of two other stocks, the U. S. Performance Tested flock shall be a combination of the same parent stocks as used in the test entry.

Reason: To limit the use of the term "Certified" to one type of flock. Flocks headed by ROP males have been designated as Certified for many years and only this meaning of the term is generally known. The inclusion of other types of flocks under the Certified classification is confusing. The use of the term Certified to designate flocks from Performance Tested Parent Stock has been very limited and is not widely recognized. The use of the term Performance Tested to describe products from Performance Tested Parent Stock seems to be logical.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division

Proposal No. 72

§ 146.10 (e) Delete

Reason: ARS 44-8, listing participation in the National Plan, indicates only a few States and a very few hatcheries in the Passed classification throughout the United States.

Proposal No. 72 (cont'd.)

The major difference in National Plan provisions for the two classifications is that Clean allows qualification, following reactors, only after two negative tests while Passed permits qualification on one negative test.

Since the National Plans set up standards of quality control as regards pullorum-typhoid and since the Plan has been in effect for a number of years and the incidence of reactors has been reduced to a nominal figure, and;

Since the control of pullorum-typhoid can be best accomplished by a detection and elimination program:

It is recommended that, in the interest of progress and to indicate that the Plan has a sincere interest in the elimination of pullorum-typhoid, only the Clean classification be included in the Plan.

Proponents: Poultry Improvement Advisory Board, California
Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

INSPECTIONS

Proposal No. 73

§ 146.12 (b) First sentence - Change to read:

Each year at least 50% of the flocks selected and tested by Authorized Agents shall be inspected by a State Inspector.

Reason: It is felt that a higher percentage is necessary in this day of larger but fewer flocks.

Proponent: Pennsylvania Department of Agriculture, Bureau of Markets

CENTRAL TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TESTS

Proposal No. 74

§146.30 (g) Delete the phrase:

Provided that varieties of different size or color shall be separated.

Reason: This is a matter which should be left to the discretion of the test management. It may not be necessary under all conditions to brood and rear separately the varieties of different size or color.

Proponent: Poultry Improvement Staff, AH Division.

Proposal No. 75

§146.30 (i) (4) Delete the parenthetical statement:

When feed conversion data are obtained all birds that die shall be weighed at the time of death and such weights used in the computations.

and

§146.30 (i) (10) Add:

When reported, feed conversion shall be expressed as pounds of feed required to produce one pound of turkey and shall be computed from the feed consumed and the live weight of marketable birds.

Reason: There is no logical reason why entries should be given credit for un-marketable meat in determining feed conversion. Industry people have no confidence in conversion figures when they find worthless meat; i. e., prematurely dead birds, considered in such figures. Since feed conversions are much better in early stages of growth, present provisions may actually permit the entries having the highest and earliest mortality to show best feed conversion. What economic value does a bird have if it has a high conversion rate but does not live to reach a marketable age and weight?

Proposal No. 75 (continued)

Reason: (cont'd) Central chicken meat production tests have no provisions to include the weight of dead birds when figuring feed conversion. This change would make the chicken Plan and the turkey Plan consistent on this particular point.

Proponent: E. S. McConnell, Browning Turkey Farms, Winchester, Kentucky

Proposal No. 76

§146.30 (i) (7) First sentence, change to read:

Average breast width, body depth and keel length of the live birds, by sexes.

Reason: To improve the accuracy of the data obtained, and bring about more uniformity between tests.

Proponent: Division of Poultry Industries, Minnesota Department of Agriculture, Dairy and Food.

Proposal No. 77

§146.30 (i) (7) Add:

The keel length shall be measured by the chord from the anterior to the posterior end of the keel.

Reason: To improve accuracy of measurement and provide for more uniformity between tests.

Proponent: Oklahoma Turkey Breeding Advisory Board

Proposal No. 78

§146.30 (i) (8) Delete

Proposal No. 78 (continued)

Explanation: This change was recommended by the General Conference Committee Meeting in June, 1959. Such changes remain in effect only until confirmed or rejected by the next National Plans Conference or rescinded by the Committee.

Proposal No. 79

§146.30 (i) Add a new sub-paragraph to read:

The percentage of birds with the following defects: Pendulous crop, roach back, leg weakness, and breast blisters.

Explanation: This change was recommended by the General Conference Committee Meeting in June, 1959. Such changes remain in effect only until confirmed or rejected by the next National Plans Conference or rescinded by the Committee.

ON-THE-FARM TURKEY MEAT PRODUCTION TESTS

Proposal No. 80

§146.31 (f) (8) Delete

Explanation: This change was recommended by the General Conference Committee Meeting in June, 1959. Such changes remain in effect only until confirmed or rejected by the next National Plans Conference or rescinded by the Committee.

Proposal No. 81

§146.31 (f) Add a new sub-paragraph to read:

The percentage of birds with the following defects: Pendulous crop, roach back, leg weakness, and breast blisters.

Explanation: This change was recommended by the General Conference Committee Meeting in June, 1959. Such changes remain in effect only until confirmed or rejected by the next National Plans Conference or rescinded by the Committee.

